Training and Predictability of University Teachers' Job Performance: Empirical Evidence from Ghana

Emmanuel Erastus Yamoah
University of Education, Winneba

This study sought to determine whether training significantly influence the job performance of university teachers. The researcher utilized descriptive survey design and collected primary data from lecturers of five universities in Ghana. Findings indicate significant positive relationship between training and job performance. Furthermore, training was found to be predictors of the teachers' task and organisational citizenship performance. This study recommends that management of universities should provide healthy environment for learning and growing for teachers and offer more opportunities for training of teachers who exhibit high proclivity for organisational citizenship behaviour.

Keywords: Training, University Teachers, Ghana, Job Performance

INTRODUCTION

Main (2002) stated that employee training plays a vital role in teaching and learning. He (2002) further opined that if training is to play a useful role in developing good teaching and effective learning in British universities, it must be accompanied by a continued improvement in teaching facilities, the encouragement of educational innovation and effective reward for good teaching. He said if these three things are to happen, employee training and development at all levels must be given every encouragement and opportunity to work. Adeniyi (2001) made it clear that in order for Africa to develop in the right direction, higher education must be properly planned. This can be achieved through highly qualified and well motivated faculty. He, however, observed that there is acute manpower needs in almost all fields in African Universities or tertiary institutions and in some institutions, minimum academic standards are hardly ever attained. There is the need to provide the necessary facilities and opportunities and time to train the young and bright scholars who emerge as graduates from the institutions. There is also a real danger of loss of quality which if not stemmed by appropriate measures, may seriously undermine the research and training base of Universities in Africa.

Ghanaian universities continue to face the challenge of operating efficiently and delivering consistent quality education. Ikonne (2014) argued that inadequate and poor training practices contribute to poor performance of academic staff of universities. It is very important to work on addressing these problems because the most significant resource in any university is its academic personnel. Training enables teachers to acquire specific knowledge and skills to perform appropriate tasks and responsibilities within the broader set of standards of the university. While many studies have focused on the role of training in improving job performance of university teachers, the same cannot be said of a developing country such as Ghana.

This research will contribute to the existing literature while presenting perspectives from a developing country. The following null hypotheses were tested:

H_{o1}: *There is no statistically significant relationship between university teachers' training and job performance.*

H_{o2}: *There is no statistically significant relationship between university teachers' training and task performance.*

H_{o3}: *There is no statistically significant relationship between university teachers' training and organisational citizenship behaviour.*

H_{o4}: *There is no statistically significant relationship between university teachers' training and counterproductive behaviour.*

TRAINING AND JOB PERFORMANCE

A university is only as effective as the people working in it. It is a fact that the provision of quality education depends on the quality of the workforce especially teachers. Training has been associated with improvements in university teachers' job performance (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Guthrie, 1982). Noe (2002) defined training as the systematic process initiated by the organisation resulting in the relatively permanent changes in the knowledge, skills, or attitudes of organisational members. It is literally impossible today for any individual to take on a job or enter a profession and remain in it for years with his skills basically unchanged. Employee training is not only desirable but it is an activity which management must commit human and fiscal resources if it is to maintain a skilled and knowledgeable personnel. Employee training is a process of altering employee's behaviour to further organisational goals. Noe (1986) proposed and later tested a model of training effectiveness. Noe (1986) fundamental thesis was that training success was determined not only by the quality of training (or the effectiveness of a specific method), but by interpersonal, social, and structural characteristics reflecting the relationship of the trainees and the training program to the broader organizational context. Variables such as organisational support or an individual's readiness for training could augment or negate the direct impact of the training itself. Learning during training is influenced by factors both prior to and during the training itself (Noe, 1986).

Burke (1995) found that employees that participated in the greatest number of training programmes and rated the trainings they attended as most relevant, viewed the organisation as being more supportive, looked at the organisation more favourably, and had less of intent to quit. One could argue that training was able to enhance the employee's sense of debt towards the organization. The result is a more committed employee that has a greater desire to remain. Because of the practical implications of training, it is important to have training that is effective. Studies have proven that more costly but effective training can save money that is wasted on cheap but inefficient training (Ginsberg, 1997). Trained employees have more reciprocity. Reciprocity essentially means that an employee will help the organisation because the organisation helped them. This parallels the notion of the employee having a "sense of debt" towards the organisation. Research on this element of commitment indicates that training can play an integral role in building a sense of debt to the company. Training that achieves reciprocity in the employee will foster an individual's commitment to the organisation. Many scholars agree that organisations that train their employees consistently have better outcomes than those that do not (Elangovan & Karakowsky, 1999). When business environments change quickly and abruptly, it is typically the organisations with the best trained employees that adapt and adjust most efficiently. Glance, et al. (1997) determined these statements to be accurate in their study that looked at training and turnover from the perspective of evolving organisations. The researchers affirmed that training encourages "spontaneous cooperation" in

many large organisations. Even in fast moving and ever evolving industries, the cooperation that can be achieved through training could lessen the need for complicated company policies.

Thomas (1997) argued that employee training equips employees with skills that enable them to become more efficient and productive workers. Furthermore, employees who are well-trained often have higher motivation and morale because they feel that the company has invested in their ability and development. This also results in lower turnover rates. Devins and Suntherland (2012) found that trained employees often work better as teams because everyone is aware of the expectations and can achieve them together smoothly. Trained employees are also more confident in their performance and decision-making skills. In addition, employees who receive regular training are more likely to accept change and come up with new ideas. Employees who learn new skills through training make good candidates for promotions because they have shown their ability to learn, retain and use information. Reliable, skilled employees can also be empowered to train other employees, the fact that reduces pressure for the management team. Denham (2008) stated that organisations that don't invest in talent are two and a half times more likely to fail, whereas those that carry on training will recover more quickly. Abay (2010) stated that training improves employees' ability in accomplishing different tasks. He found that those employees who have taken trainings were more capable in performing different task & vice versa. Training has direct relationship with the employees' performance. Similar findings were reported by Elnegal and Imran (2013), Jagero and Komba (2012), Singh and Mohanty (2012), Manu (2004) and Tennant, Boonkrong and Roberts (2002). However, Jagero and Komba (2012) posited that while training is a factor in job performance, it is the combination of factors such as working environment, employee skills and knowledge, motivation and rewards, communication flow and organizational culture that significantly improve employees' performance.

Gibbs and Coffey (2004) investigated and established that training impacted significantly on the performance and quality of university teachers. In an earlier study (Coffey & Gibbs, 2000), they reported that university teachers who were trained exhibited notable improvements in teaching approaches, researching techniques, learning motivation, enthusiasm and commitment to their organisations. Training enables university teachers to improve on teaching skills and to become more student-centred in their teaching methods (Prosser & Trigwell, 1999).

METHODOLOGY

The study employed descriptive survey design to collect data from 335 lecturers in five public universities in Ghana in order to examine the effect of university teachers' training on their job performance. The primary method utilized for data collection was structured questionnaire. Quota sampling technique was used in the selection of lecturers in order to broaden the representation of various disciplines within the universities. University teachers' job performance was based on the three-categorisation postulated by Rotundo (2000). These are task performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive behaviour. Rotundo (2002) explained task performance as behaviour that is consistent with performing duties and responsibilities. Organisational citizenship performance includes behaviours that are clearly related to organisational goals in a positive way but do not necessarily contribute to the core functioning of the organisation (e.g., exerting effort, maintaining professional relationships, and supporting and helping others). The third category is counterproductive behaviour. It represents negative behaviours that can harm the well-being of the organisation or co-workers (e.g., substance abuse, absenteeism, tardiness, theft). In measuring performance, the researcher converted the items which measure task performance, organisational citizenship, and counterproductive behaviour into a five-point scale and found the averages of the responses. Individuals who scored below the average mark were touted as not performing while individuals who scored above the average mark were labelled as performing. The sum of the three subset scores is job performance. Cronbach's Alpha co-efficients of reliability were calculated for training and job performance. The result indicated a high level of internal consistency: training (0.85), job performance (0.90). The benchmark for reliability Cronbach Alpha score as recommended by Nunnally (1978) is 0.70.

After the collection of the data from the field, the data was sorted, coded and analysed. The data was entered into Stata 13 and IBM SPSS 20 software. Two techniques of data analysis were adopted to analyse the data gathered from the respondents: descriptive and inferential statistics. The simple regression equation was used to estimate the effects of training on university teachers' job performance. Data was double entered for verification to minimize human data entry error. Errors, inconsistencies, and missing data were verified with the original questionnaires. Hypotheses resulting in test statistics with $p \leq .05$ were rejected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Frequency of Training and Quality of Training

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of training their institution has given them within the past two years. 97% of the respondents had undergone at least one form of training within the past two years. Therefore, we can infer that regular training is carried out for lecturers of these institutions. Respondents were asked to assess the quality of a recent training they have undergone. The result is presented in table I below.

TABLE 1
TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES AND MEAN OF RESPONSES

	N	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	Mean
Objectives of the training were well stated by the instructor/facilitator	332	48 (14.5)	7 (2.1)	277 (83.4)	-	3.1235
All necessary resources needed for the training were provided	331	-	15 (4.5)	204 (61.6)	112 (33.8)	3.2931
The instructor was well prepared	332	-	26 (7.8%)	173 (52.1)	133 (40.1)	3.3223
The physical environment was conducive	326	-	8 (2.4)	112 (33.7)	206 (62.0)	3.6074
Management was fully involved and supportive	326	1 (0.3)	20 (6.0)	239 (72.0)	66 (19.9)	3.1350
The skills taught at the training are relevant to my work	330	1 (0.3)	6 (1.8)	198 (59.6)	126 (37.7)	3.3545
Grand Mean						3.3059

The respondents expressed their views on whether objectives of the training attended were clearly stated by the facilitator. The result indicates that 277 (83.4%) agreed while 55 (16.6%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. On whether all necessary resources needed for the training were provided, only 15 (4.5%) of the respondents disagreed while the remaining majority either agreed or strongly agreed to the statement.

For respondents view on the preparedness of the facilitator, result indicates 26 (7.8%) disagreed, 173 (52.1%) agreed, and 133(40.1%). The physical environment was adjudged to be very conducive for training as only 8 (2.4%) disagreed, 112 (33.7%) agreed and 206 (62%) strongly agreed. The management of the universities were perceived to be fully involved and supportive of the training as 239 (72%) agreed, 66 (19.9%) strongly agreed with only 21 respondents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The respondents perceived the skills taught at the training as being relevant to their work as indicated by the

results; 126 (37.7%) strongly agreed, 198 (59.6%) agreed, 6 (1.8%) disagreed and 1 (0.3%) strongly disagreed.

University Teachers' Performance

This study investigated the performance of the respondents. The results of employee performance as categorized are presented below. In table 2, the result of teachers' performance in their primary duties and responsibilities (core tasks) is presented.

TABLE 2
TASK PERFORMANCE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF RESPONSES

Tasks	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Revision of Taught Courses	332	2.00	5.00	3.2410	.53495
Provision of Quality Feedback	332	2.00	5.00	3.5904	.63219
Demonstrating Current Knowledge	332	2.00	5.00	3.7651	.61618
Keeping Accurate Records	332	1.00	5.00	3.9729	.62369
Achieving positive evaluation	332	2.00	5.00	3.6205	.67806
Publication in Top Journals	331	1.00	4.00	2.5196	.86098
Book Publications	332	1.00	5.00	2.2259	1.00761
Participation in Conferences	331	1.00	5.00	3.1994	1.35606
Serving on Committees	331	1.00	5.00	4.0211	.71106
Academic Advising	331	1.00	5.00	3.9728	.77997
Grand Mean				3.4129	

The items were measured on a five-point scale. The mean of task performance of employees was 3.4129 which indicates strong performance. The respondents' strongest performance was in serving on committees with a mean of 4.0211 and standard deviation of 0.71106. The high interest and performance in committee work could be due to its value to the respondents in terms of promotion as it is one of the key assessable areas for promotion in the tertiary educational institutions. Other strong areas of performance include keeping accurate records (mean = 3.9729), academic advising (mean = 3.9728) and demonstrating current knowledge in teaching (mean = 3.7651). The respondents' performance in provision of timely and quality feedback to students shows a mean score of 3.5904 and standard deviation of 0.63219 signifying a positive result.

The result further shows that the respondents were underperforming in certain areas of their primary job responsibilities. The least area of performance was in book publication in their discipline. The result shows a mean score of 2.2259 and standard deviation of 1.0076. Another area of concern was in publication of articles in top journals with a mean score of 2.5196 and standard deviation of 0.86098. The low performance in book publications and average performance in article publications may be due to a multiplicity of factors including inadequate capacity and support to engage in research and publications. The result on organisational citizenship behaviour exhibited by the respondents is shown in table 3.

TABLE 3
ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP PERFORMANCE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF RESPONSES

Citizenship Behaviour	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Helping New Employees	332	1.00	5.00	3.2771	.54553
Support Co-Workers	332	1.00	4.00	3.5181	.73516
Abreast Of Changes	332	1.00	5.00	3.7410	.64504
Praise Co-Workers	332	1.00	5.00	3.8886	.52971
Initiative to solve wk problem	332	1.00	5.00	3.7922	.63308
Promote Inst. Service	332	1.00	5.00	3.8404	.82363
Defend Organization	332	1.00	5.00	2.9699	1.27691
Grand Mean				3.5753	

The mean of organisational citizenship performance of the university teachers was 3.5753 which indicates strong performance in organisational citizenship behaviour. The result shows that on a five-point scale "praise co-workers when they are successful" is the behaviour item the respondents showed their greatest strength in with a mean score of 3.8886 and standard deviation of 0.52971. This is followed by "promotion of the institution's services" with a mean score of 3.8404 and standard deviation of 0.82363. The third best performing area of organisational citizenship behaviour was "taking initiative to solve a work problem" with a mean score of 3.7922. The least citizenship behaviour performance was "defend the organisation if others criticize it". The result of employees' counterproductive behaviour is presented in table 4.

TABLE 4
COUNTERPRODUCTIVE (CP) PERFORMANCE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF RESPONSES

CP Behaviour	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Act Rudely	331	1.00	4.00	2.4653	2.09498
Littered Around	332	1.00	4.00	1.5753	.78720
Lateness	332	1.00	3.00	1.7922	.90427
Call In Sick	332	1.00	3.00	1.7681	.89837
Little Effort	332	1.00	3.00	1.8976	.89056
Lost Temper	332	1.00	4.00	2.6084	.94100
Grand Mean				2.0178	

The mean of counterproductive behaviour of respondents was 2.0178 indicating below average performance. The result shows under-performance in almost all the counterproductive behaviour items on a five-point scale. The worst area of counterproductive performance was in "littered your work environment" with a mean score of 1.5753 and standard deviation of 0.78720. This implies that majority of the respondents have littered the work environment before. A contributing factor for this counterproductive behaviour could be due to inadequate refuse bins in classrooms and other work areas as observed by the researcher. The result further shows that respondents sometimes call in sick when they were not sick (mean = 1.7681) and lateness to work was also a serious problem (mean = 1.7922) The slightly average performing areas of counterproductive behaviour of respondents were recorded in not engaging in rude behaviour toward someone at work (mean = 2.4653) and not losing temper at work (mean = 2.6084). The next section will test the hypothesis to ascertain the statistical significance of the relationships between the variables described above.

Testing Hypothesis One

Research hypothesis 1 (H_{o1}): There is no statistically significant relationship between university teachers' training and job performance. The results are presented in tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 5
ANOVA - TRAINING ON JOB PERFORMANCE

Source	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Model	1.57	1	1.57	11.17	0.001
Residual	28.81	319	0.1405		
Total	30.38	320	0.147		

TABLE 6
TRAINING AND JOB PERFORMANCE

Model	Coefficient	Standard error	t	Sig.
Training	0.214	0.077	2.76	0.006
Constant	0.436	0.148	2.94	0.004

R-Squared=0.05
R-squared Adjusted=0.047

The first hypothesis stated that no statistically significant relationship would be detected between university teachers' training and job performance. Tables 5 and 6 provide a test of the relationship between training and job performance. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) shows that training significantly affects job performance. The F test shows statistical significance at p=0.001. Table 6 is a simple regression of training on job performance. There is a significant positive relationship between university teachers' job performance and training (p=0.006). We can infer from the table that an increase in training by one unit increases employee's performance by about 0.214 units. The coefficient of determination (R-squared) which states the proportion (percentage) of the (sample) variation in the dependent variable that can be attributed to the independent variable is 5%. We can infer from this that the teacher's performance is affected by several variables as training accounted for only 5%. The adjusted R square (R^2=0.047) refers to the best estimate of R square for the population from which the sample was drawn.

Discussion of Findings

This study investigated training and university teachers' job performance and the result reveals that there is a significant relationship between the two variables (R^2=0.05, p=0.006). On a five-point scale, the teachers performed very well in tasks such as serving on committees (mean=4.0211), academic advising of students (mean=3.9728), keeping accurate records on students (mean=3.9729), demonstrating current knowledge of subjects (mean=3.7651), achieving positive evaluation from students (mean=3.6205), providing quality feedback to students (mean=3.5904), revising course syllabus (mean=3.2410) and participation in conferences (mean=3.1994).

Additionally, training positively influenced the teachers' organisational citizenship behaviour as they achieved high rating on a five-point scale in behaviours such as "praise co-workers when they are successful" (mean=3.8886), "promotion of the institution's services" (mean=3.8404), "taking initiative to solve work problem" (mean=3.7922), "keeping abreast of changes in the organisation" (mean=3.7410), "supporting co-workers with personal problems" (mean=3.5181) and "helping new employees to settle" (mean=3.2771). There is strong positive relationship between training (mean=3.3059) and employees' performance (mean=3.002).

The investigation of the hypothesis indicates that the relationship between training and job performance is statistically significant (p=0.006). This finding is in congruous with Coffey & Gibbs

(2000) and Prosser & Trigwell (1999) who carried out an extensive study on the impact of training on university teachers' job performance. While Coffey & Gibbs (2000) found that training improves university teachers' methods of teaching, research techniques, enthusiasm and commitment to their institutions; Prosser & Trigwell (1999) established that training made university teachers to be more student-centred and less teacher-centred in their method of teaching. Similarly, Bhutto, et al. (2016) concluded that training significantly improved the overall confidence of university teachers in their perceived abilities and skills to better perform both teaching and research duties. In contrast, studies conducted by Liisa, et al. (2007) did not find significant relationship between training and job performance of university teachers.

The study finding is also broadly consistent with prior management literature on training and job performance. Previous studies found that particular training approach, given time and support, had direct, dramatic effect on job performance (Joyce & Glynn, 1989; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Manu, 2004; Steedman & Wagner, 2009; Kennedy, 2009; Jagero & Kombe, 2012). Training has been proved to generate performance improvement related benefits for the employee as well as for the organisation by positively influencing employee performance through the development of employee knowledge, skills, ability, competencies and behaviour (Guest, 1997; Harrison, 2000; Afshan et al. 2012). Moreover, other studies, for example, one by Swart et al. (2005) elaborated on training as a means of dealing with skill deficits and performance gaps as a way of improving job performance. According to Wright and Geroy (2001), employee competencies change through effective training programmes. It not only improves the overall performance of the employees to effectively perform the current job but also enhance the knowledge, skills and attitude of the workers necessary for the future job, thus contributing to superior organisational performance. Through training the employees' competencies are developed and enable them to implement the job-related work efficiently, and achieve organisation objectives in a competitive manner. Further still, dissatisfaction complaints, absenteeism and turnover can be greatly reduced when employees are well trained so that they can experience the direct satisfaction associated with the sense of achievement and knowledge that they are developing their inherent capabilities (Pigors & Myers, 1989). The results have shown that university teachers' job performance is significantly related to training ($p=0.006$; $p<0.05$). Thus, training increases job performance as theory predicted.

Testing Hypotheses Two, Three, Four

Research hypothesis 2, 3, 4 ($H_{o2,}$ $H_{o3,}$ H_{o4}): There is no statistically significant relationship between training and university teachers' task performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive behaviour.

This study further analysed the effect of training on specific performance items. University teachers' job performance is categorized into task performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and counterproductive behaviour. The purpose of this step-by-step approach was to understand the effect of training on these categories of job performance. This would reveal any underperformance in any of the three categories of performance which would not show in the job performance. The results are covered by the Tables 7 – 12.

TABLE 7
ANOVA - TRAINING ON TASK PERFORMANCE

Source	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Model	3.013	1	3.0137	12.69	0.005
Residual	48.44	319	0.237		
Total	51.45	320	0.251		

TABLE 8
TRAINING AND TASK PERFORMANCE

Model	Coefficient	Standard error	t	Sig.
Training	0.297	0.078	3.7	0.000
Constant	-0.18	0.142	-0.13	0.897

R-Squared=0.05
Adjusted R-squared=0.0540

TABLE 9
ANOVA - TRAINING ON ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Source	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Model	0.951	1	0.951	6.09	0.0144
Residual	31.888	319	0.156		
Total	32.839	320	0.160		

TABLE 10
TRAINING AND ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Model	Coefficient	Standard error	t	Sig.
Training	0.168	0.078	2.14	0.033
Constant	0.497	0.149	3.34	0.001

R-Squared=0.0290
R-Squared adjusted=0.0212

TABLE 11
ANOVA - TRAINING ON COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOUR

Source	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Model	0.048	1	0.048	0.96	0.3287
Residual	10.366	319	0.051		
Total	10.415	320	0.051		

TABLE 12
TRAINING AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOUR

Model	Coefficient	Standard error	t	Sig.
Training	-0.0377	0.029	-1.27	0.207
Constant	1.014	0.049	20.35	0.000

R-Squared=0.0047
Adjusted R-squared=-0.0002

The analysis of variance (table 7) shows that training significantly influences task performance of the respondents, F-test ($F_{1,319}$ = 12.69, $p>F$ = 0.005). Table 8 also reports the simple regression of training on task performance. There is a strong positive relationship between training and task performance (p=0.000). The results also show that an increase in training by one unit increases task performance by 0.29 units. The coefficient of determination also shows that training alone explains 5% of the variation in task performance. It can also be seen in the ANOVA table 9 that there is a statistically significant relationship between training and organisational citizenship behaviour

($F_{1,319} = 6.09$, $p>F = 0.0144$). The simple regression (see table 10) also shows a significant positive relationship between training and employees' organisational citizenship performance (p=0.033).

The results reported in Tables 11 and 12 show that there is no statistically significant relationship between training and the respondents' counterproductive behaviour. In the ANOVA table, it is reported that ($F_{1,319} = 0.96$, $p>F = 0.328$). This is not statistically significant. The simple regression of training on counterproductive performance also shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between training and counterproductive behaviour of the university teachers (p>t=0.207).

Discussion of Findings

This study investigated the relationship between training and university teachers' task, organisational citizenship, and counterproductive performance. The results indicated that task performance and organisational citizenship performance are significantly influenced by training. However, the effect of training on university teachers' counterproductive behaviour was not significant. Researchers conceptualize task performance as behaviours that contribute directly or indirectly to the technical core and recognized as part of the job (Rotundo, 2002). Almost all frameworks mentioned task performance as an important dimension of individual job performance (Koopmans, et al. 2013). Task performance which is also known as 'technical proficiency' or 'job-specific task proficiency' has long been associated with training (Campbell, et al. 2001). Although what constitute core job tasks can differ from job to job, training does improve individual task performance across professions (Renn & Fedor, 2001).

Previous work done by Guthrie (1982), Gibbs & Coffey (2004), Amin, et al. (2013) all confirmed that training make university teachers more effective in performing core duties and responsibilities. The significant relationship between training and task performance is in line with the findings of Bernthanl (1998) who used Spearman's rank to find the relationship between training and task performance. He obtained r – 0.86 a strong relationship. He found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. He argued that training increased the level of skill and expertise of the employees, which translated into quality services. Abay (2010) reported that significant relationship was found between the employees training and their resultant performance in accomplishing different tasks. He argued that those employees who have undergone training were more capable in performing different task. Training promotes task performance by providing employees with more declarative and procedural knowledge with which they can complete their tasks successfully (Thomas & Fieldman, 2009). For example, more training in accounting software helps Accounting lecturers to become more proficient in the use of the package; thus equipping them with deeper competence to teach their students better.

The relationship between university teachers' training and organisational citizenship behaviour is positive. On a five-point scale, training (mean= 3.3059) affected the teachers' organisational citizenship behaviour such as "praise co-workers when they are successful" (mean=3.8886), "promotion of the institution's services" (mean=3.8404), "taking initiative to solve work problem" (mean=3.7922), "keeping abreast of changes in the organisation" (mean=3.7410), "supporting co-workers with personal problems" (mean=3.5181) and "helping new employees" (mean=3.2771). The grand mean of organisational citizenship behaviours was 3.5753. These results suggest strong positive relationship between training and organisational citizenship behaviour. The results of the regression analysis provide confirmation of statistically significant relationship between the variables (R^2=0.029; p=0.033). Previous research by Murtar et al. (2012) also reported significant relationship between training and organisational citizenship behaviour. Training not only enhanced the skills and capabilities of employees but also increased their desire and commitment to achieving organisation goals by going beyond their primary duties. Johnson and Elder (2002) in a longitudinal study concluded that individuals with more training tend to attach greater importance to altruistic rewards (e.g., helping others) and social rewards (e.g., developing good relationship with others). Rose (2005), Konovsky and Organ (1996) found similar results in cross-sectional studies. Furthermore, other researchers have found that years of training were positively related to conscientiousness, even when controlling for other socio-demographic variables (Dudley, et al. 2006).

The relationship between university teachers' training and counterproductive behaviour was also investigated. On a five-point scale the performance of teachers in counterproductive behaviours was below average in 5 out of 6 items that were assessed – "Act Rudely" (mean=2.4653), "Little Effort" (mean=1.8976), "Lateness" (mean=1.7922), "Call-in sick when not" (mean=1.7681), "Littering the work environment" (mean=1.5753). Low mean scores of counterproductive items imply that the employees engaged in counterproductive behaviours frequently. The relationship between training (mean=3.3059) and counterproductive performance (mean=2.0178) is positive. However, the regression analysis indicates that the relationship between training and counterproductive behaviour is not statistically significant (R^2=0.004; p=0.786; p>0.05). We therefore accept the hypothesis 4. Idiakheua and Obetoh (2013) made similar findings. They argued that counterproductive work behaviour is influenced largely by environmental reasons, employees' personality and life changes. They posited that perceptions of fairness in the workplace are strong drivers of counterproductive behaviours. Contrary to our findings, Ohemeng (2009), Lau, et al. (2003) postulated that training practices have an optimistic impact on reducing or controlling counterproductive work behaviour. Other scholars assert that values acquired through training (such as responsibility and moral integrity) should be negatively related to counterproductive behaviour (Thomas & Fieldman, 2009). Therefore, workers with more years of training are less likely to pose danger to co-workers or customers by ignoring safety instructions (Oh & Shin, 2003).

CONCLUSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

In this study, it has been shown empirically that training makes university teachers more effective at performing tasks and organisational citizenship behaviour. This surely augurs well for the universities' expectations of highly trained workforce. However, given the variance among teachers' self-evaluations, university management should ensure that recipients of training programmes are fairly homogeneous in terms of levels of skills and knowledge.

Furthermore, university teachers who exhibits high tendency for organisational citizenship behaviour could be given preferential treatment to participate in more training programmes. Such teachers already have the desired attitudes and when coupled with necessary skills, they could turn out to be high performers (Ajgaonkar et al. 2012). University management should provide a healthy environment for learning and growing and offer more opportunities for career development of teachers. Increased investments in training of university teachers will create a critical mass of workers with high preference for excellence in higher education.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Study

This study investigated the relationship between university teachers' training and job performance. The findings demonstrate that training has an impact on teachers' task and organisational citizenship behaviour. However, since all measures used are self-reports, social desirability effect could be a problem. Although self-report data are commonly used to measure individual self-perception, one should bear in mind that they may not reflect the actual performance of the respondents. Thus, a more robust method would be advised in future studies that uses multisource data collection from teachers and their supervisors.

Finally, future studies should also focus on stability of job performance as intuition suggests that university teachers' job performance should improve over time with training.

REFERENCES

Abay, A. (2010). *The HRM agenda of process focused organizations.* Paper presented to the national workshop of the millennium civil service, Federal Civil Service Agency, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Adeniyi, A. (2001). University Teaching in Africa. *Association of African Universities*, 22(23), African Universities Press.

Ajgaonkar, M., Baul, U., & Phadke, S. M. (2012). Relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and job characteristics model of motivation: An empirical study. *NMIMS Management Review*, April – May.

Amin, A., Saeed, R., Lodhi, R. N., Iqbal, A., & Tehreem, R. (2013). The impact of employees training on job performance in education sector of Pakistan. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 17(9), 1273-1278.

Bernthanl, P. (1998). *Measuring the impact of training and development*. White Paper, Development Dimensions International, Philadelphia.

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2006). Educational attainment as a proxy for cognitive ability in selection: Effects of levels of cognitive ability and adverse impact. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 696-705.

Bhutto, G. M., Khoso, I., & Jhatial, A. A. (2016). Assessing the impact of higher education commission's training on university teachers' performance: Case of University of Sindh. *The Shield*, 11, 27-45.

Burke, R. J. (1995). Benefits of formal training courses within a professional services firm. *Journal of Management Development*, 14(3).

Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2000). The evaluation of the student evaluation of educational quality questionnaire in UK higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(1), 89-93.

Denham J. (2008, October). *The impact of training on survival and growth*. *Speech to the CBI*, 24.

Devins, D., Johnson, S., & Sutherland J. (2012). Employee training benefits to small Businesses. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 11(4).

Dudley, M. N., Orvis K., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 40-57.

Elangovan, A. R., & Karakowsky, L. (1999). The role of trainee and environmental factors in transfer of training: an exploratory framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 20(5), 268 – 276.

Elnaga1, A., & Imran, A. (2013). The effect of training on employee performance, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4).

Glance, N. S., Hogg, T., & Huberman, B. A. (1997). Training and turnover in the evolution of organizations. *Organization Science*, 8.

Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(1), 87–100.

Ginsberg, L. (1997). Training for the long haul. *Computer Shopper*, 17.

Goldberg, L. R., Sweeney, D., Merenda, P. F., & Hughes, J. E. (1998). Demographic variables and personality: The effects of gender, age, education, and ethic/racial status on self-descriptions of personality attributes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 393-403.

Guthrie G. (1982). Reviews of teacher training and teacher performance in developing countries*, International Review of Education*, UNESCO Institute for Education, 291-306.

Ikonne, C.N. (2014). *Assessment of universities academic quality report*. A Paper Presented at Academic Quality Seminar, Forest Hotel, Accra.

Jagero, N., & Komba, H. V. (2012). Relationship between on the job training and employee's performance in courier companies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science*, 2(22), Nov.

Johnson, M. K., & Elder, G. (2002). Educational pathways and work value trajectories. *Sociological Perspectives*, 45, 113-138.

Joyce, S., & Glynn, T. (1989), *Staff performance.* London: Addison and Wesley.

Kennedy J. (2009). *The impact of training and development on job performance – A Case Study of the Judicial Service of Ghana*. A Masters Thesis, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.

Konovsky, J., & Organ, E. (1996). Dispositional and contextual dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253-266.

Koopmans, L., Bernaads, C., Hildebrandt, V., van der Beek, A., & De Vet, H. (2013). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(1), 6-28.

Liisa, P., Sari, L., & Anne, N. (2007). The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23, 557-571.

Manu, S. (2004). *Training and development techniques for improving organisational performance for Ghana firms*. Unpublished A Master of Science Thesis, University of Wisconsin – Stout.

Main, A. N. (2002). The training of university teachers development in Britain. *Association of Commonwealth Universities*, 18, University of Strathclyde Glasgow.

Murhtav, A., Sial, M., Imran, A., & Jilani, S.M.A (2012). Impact of HR practices on organizational citizenship behavior and mediating effect of organizational commitment in NGOs of Pakistan. *World Applied Science Journal*, 18(7), 901-908.

Noe, R. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2002). *Planning for training impact: Principles of training effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Noe, R.A. (2002). *Employee training and development*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Noe, R. A. (1986). Trainees' attributes and attitudes: Neglected influences on training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 736-749.

Nunnaly, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oh, J., & Shin, E. H. (2003). Inequalities in nonfatal work injury: The significance of race, human capital, and occupations. *Social Science and Medicine*, 57, 2173-2182.

Ohemeng, F. L. K. (2009). Constraints in the implementation of performance management systems in developing Countries: The Ghanaian case. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*. 9(1), 109-132.

Pigors, P., & Myers, A. C. (1989). *Personnel administration, A point of view and method*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching. The experience in higher Education*. Suffolk: Open University Press.

Quifones, M. A. (1997). *Contextual influences on training effectiveness*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Rose, M. (2005). Do rising levels of qualification alter work ethic, work orientation and organizational commitment for the worse? Evidence from the UK, 1985-2001. *Journal of Education and Work*, 18, 131-164.

Renn, R. W., & Fedor, D. B. (2001). Self-efficacy and goal setting model of work Performance. *Journal of Management*, 27.

Rotundo, M. (2000). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. D*issertation Abstracts International*, 61(5-A).

Rotundo, M. (2002). *Defining and measuring individual level job performance: A review and integration*. Retrieved from citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/19/05/14

Singh, R., & Mohanty, M. (2012). Impact of training practices on employee productivity: A comparative study. *Interscience Management Review*, 2(2).
Steedman, H., & Wagner, K. (2009, May). Productivity, machinery and skills. *National Institute Economics Review*, 40-57.
Tennant, C., Boonkrong, M., & Roberts, P (2002). The design of a training programme measurement model. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 26(5).
Thomas A. (1997). Training the knowledge worker: a descriptive study of training practices in Irish software companies. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 27(2/3/4).
Thomas, W., & Fieldman, D. (2009). How broadly does education contribute to job performance? *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 89-134.
Wright, P., & Geroy, D. G. (2001). Changing the mindset: the training myth and the need for word-class performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(4), 586–600.